

REMARKS

Claims 1-42 are pending in the present application. Applicant respectfully traverses the restriction requirement, and provisionally elects group I, as discussed below. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 121

The Office Action requires a restriction to one of the following sets of claims:

- I. Claims 1-10, 17-24;
- II. Claims 8-14
- III. Claims 15, 16
- IV. Claims 25-32, 38-42
- V. Claims 33-37

In response to the Restriction Requirement, Applicant respectfully traverses the restriction requirement and provisionally elects group I, claims 1-10 and 17-24.

Applicant respectfully submits that the current Restriction Requirement is not proper. MPEP sec. 803.01 states in part

If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to independent or distinct inventions.... The examiner must provide reasons and/or examples to support conclusions, but need not cite documents to support the restriction requirements in most cases.... For purposes of the initial requirement, a serious burden on the examiner may be *prima facie* shown if the examiner shows by appropriate explanation of separate classification, or separate status in the art, or a different field of search as defined in MPEP sec. 802.02.

[Emphasis added.]

In the current case, the Examiner has provided no reasons or examples of why the current application is subject to restriction. The Examiner only lists the claims and states the following conclusion:

Because these inventions are distinct as can be seen from the claims listed above for comparison and the search required for one Group is not required for another Group, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant respectfully submits that Examiner has not provided the necessary showing of a "serious burden" if restriction is not required. It is not evident from a mere listing of the claims that examination of all claims together will necessarily impose a serious burden on the Examiner. Applicant respectfully submits that Examiner provide the required "reasons and/or examples to support conclusions," as stated in the MPEP, sec. 803.01.

Applicant also respectfully submits that examination of all claims together would not impose a serious burden on the Examiner. For example, Examiner has grouped claims 19 and 33 separately. Claim 17, from which claim 19 depends, states:

17. A method for displaying web browser cookie data, comprising the steps of:
having a user connect to a targeted domain path on a server; and
displaying given first information on a web browser frame, the given first information indicating that the web browser sent a cookie to the server for the targeted path.

Claim 19 states:

19. The method as described in claim 17, wherein the given first information includes a count of a number of cookies sent to the server for the targeted URL.

Claim 33 states:

33. A computer program product in a computer readable medium, comprising:
means responsive to a user connecting to a targeted domain and path on a server for displaying first information on a web browser frame, the given first information indicating that the web browser sent a cookie to the server for the targeted domain and path; and
means operative in a current web browser session for displaying a list of cookies sent to the server for the targeted domain and path

Though Examiner has classified these two claims separately, it is respectfully submitted that examination of these together claims would not impose a serious burden on the Examiner. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Examiner has not made out a *prima facie* case for imposing a restriction requirement on the claims of the present application.

II. Conclusion

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: 12.1.03

Respectfully submitted,



Patrick C. R. Holmes
Reg. No. 46,380
Carstens, Yee & Cahoon, LLP
P.O. Box 802334
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 367-2001
Attorney for Applicants